Preprint number: KYUSHU-HET-140

Lattice energy–momentum tensor from the Yang–Mills gradient flow—inclusion of fermion fields—

Hiroki Makino[1], Hiroshi Suzuki[2,*]

[1,2] *Department of Physics, Kyushu University, 6-10-1 Hakozaki, Higashi-ku, Fukuoka, 812-8581, Japan*

[*] *E-mail: hsuzuki@phys.kyushu-u.ac.jp*

arXiv:1403.4772v2 [hep-lat] 27 Mar 2014

Local products of fields deformed by the so-called Yang–Mills gradient flow become renormalized composite operators. This fact has been utilized to construct a correctly-normalized conserved energy–momentum tensor in the lattice formulation of the pure Yang–Mills theory. In the present paper, this construction is further generalized for vector-like gauge theories containing massive fermions. For massless theories, it is not clear whether one can simply set the mass parameter in our formulation zero.

Subject Index B01, B31, B32, B38

typeset using $\mathcal{PTP}$TEX.cls

1. Introduction and the main result

Energy and momentum are fundamental notions in physics. In lattice field theory—the best-developed non-perturbative formulation of quantum field theory—, however, the construction of the corresponding Noether current, the energy–momentum tensor [1–4], is not straightforward [5, 6], because the translational invariance is explicitly broken by the lattice structure. In a recent paper [7], a possible method to avoid this complication being inherent in the energy–momentum tensor on the lattice has been proposed on the basis of the Yang–Mills gradient flow (or the Wilson flow in the context of lattice gauge theory) [8–10].[1] See Ref. [18] for a recent review on the gradient flow and Refs. [19–25] for its applications in lattice gauge theory.

The basic idea of Ref. [7] is the following: Consider the pure Yang–Mills theory. The gradient flow deforms the bare gauge field $A_\mu(x)$ according to a flow equation with a flow time t (Eq. (3.1) below) and this makes gauge field configurations "smooth" for positive flow times. It can then be shown to all orders in perturbation theory that any local products of the flowed gauge field $B_\mu(t,x)$ for any strictly-positive flow time t is ultraviolet (UV) finite when expressed in terms of renormalized parameters [9]. In particular, no multiplicative renormalization factor is required to make those local products finite. In other words, they are renormalized composite operators. Such UV finite quantities should be "universal" in the sense that they are independent of the UV regularization chosen, in the limit in which the regulator is removed. This suggests a possibility that by using the gradient flow as an intermediate tool one may bridge composite operators defined with the dimensional regularization, with which the translational invariance is manifest,[2] and those in the lattice regularization with which one may carry out non-perturbative calculations.[3] Following this idea, a formula that expresses the correctly-normalized conserved energy–momentum tensor as a $t \to 0$ limit of a certain combination of the flowed gauge field was obtained [7]. This formula provides a possible method to compute correlation functions of the energy–momentum tensor by using the lattice regularization because the universal combination in the formula should be independent of the regularization. An interesting point is that the small flow-time behavior of the (universal) coefficients in the formula can be determined by perturbation theory thanks to the asymptotic freedom. This implies that if the lattice spacing is fine enough a further non-perturbative determination of the coefficients is not necessary. (Practically, non-perturbative determination of those coefficients may be quite useful and how this determination can be carried out has been investigated in Ref. [26].) Although the validity of the formula in Ref. [7], especially the restoration of the conservation law in the continuum limit, still remains to be carefully investigated, the measurement of the interaction measure (the trace anomaly) and the entropy density of the Yang–Mills theory at finite temperature on the basis of the formula [27] shows encouraging results; the method appears to be promising even practically.

[1] In Refs. [11–16], an interesting method to define a lattice energy–momentum tensor from twisted boundary conditions has been developed. In Ref. [17], a method on the basis of the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry has been proposed.

[2] The shortage of the dimensional regularization is of course it is defined only in perturbation theory.

[3] We thus implicitly assume that the finiteness of the flowed fields that can rigorously be proven only in perturbation theory persists even in the non-perturbative level.

In Ref. [7], the method was developed only for the pure Yang–Mills theory. It is then natural to ask for wider application if the method can be generalized to gauge theories containing matter fields, especially fermion fields. In the present paper, we work out this generalization. We thus suppose a vector-like gauge theory[4] with a gauge group G that contains

$$N_f \text{ Dirac fermions in the gauge representation } R. \tag{1.1}$$

For simplicity, we assume that all N_f fermions possess a common mass; this restriction might be appropriately relaxed. For a technical reason that will be explained below, however, strictly massless theories might be singular in our present construction. At this moment, we are not sure whether one can simply set the mass parameter zero in the final formulas when we do *not* expect the spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking with the massless fermion. This would be the case for example in theories with an infrared fixed point. The applicability of our present method might be restricted in this way, although further consideration on the massless case is required.

Our main result is Eq. (4.72) and a step-by-step derivation of this master formula is given in subsequent sections. For those who are interested only in the final result, here we give a brief explanation how to read the master formula (4.72): The left-hand side is the correctly-normalized conserved energy–momentum tensor (with the vacuum expectation value is subtracted); our formula (4.72) holds only when the energy–momentum tensor is separated from other operators in correlation functions in the position space. The combinations in the right-hand side are defined by Eqs. (4.1)–(4.5). There, $G^a_{\mu\nu}(t,x)$ and D_μ are the field strength and the covariant derivative of the flowed gauge field (the definition of the flowed gauge field is identical to that of Refs. [8–10]); our *hatted* flowed fermion fields $\hat{\chi}(t,x)$ and $\hat{\bar{\chi}}(t,x)$ are, on the other hand, somewhat different from those of Ref. [10] $\chi(t,x)$ and $\bar{\chi}(t,x)$, and they are related by Eq. (3.20). Throughout this paper, the symbol m denotes the (common) renormalized mass of the fermions in the minimal subtraction (MS) or the modified minimal subtraction ($\overline{\text{MS}}$) scheme. Although the parameter m appears in various places in the master formula (4.72), it is cancelled out when expressed in terms of the flowed fermion fields in Ref. [10]. The coefficient functions $c_i(t)$ in Eq. (4.72) are given by Eqs. (4.74)–(4.78). There, $\bar{g}(q)$ and $\bar{m}(q)$ are the running coupling and the running mass parameter defined by Eqs. (4.21) and (4.22), respectively. Eqs. (4.74)–(4.78) are for the MS scheme and the result for the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme can be obtained by the replacement (4.79). b_0 and d_0 are the first coefficients of renormalization group functions, Eq. (2.16) and Eq. (2.18), respectively. The energy–momentum tensor is given by the $t \to 0$ limit in the right-hand side of Eq. (4.72). As the pure Yang–Mills case mentioned above, the combination in the right-hand side is UV finite and one may use the lattice regularization to compute the correlation functions of the combination in the right-hand side. In this way, correlation functions of the correctly-normalized conserved energy–momentum tensor are obtained. To ensure the "universality", however, the continuum limit has to be taken before the $t \to 0$ limit. Practically, with a finite lattice spacing a, the flow time t cannot be taken arbitrarily small to keep the contact with the continuum physics. Instead, we have a natural constraint,

$$a \ll \sqrt{8t} \ll R, \tag{1.2}$$

[4] We assume that the gauge theory is asymptotically free.

where R denotes a typical physical scale, such as the hadronic scale or the box size. The extrapolation for $t \to 0$ thus generally requires a sufficiently fine lattice.

Here is our definition of the quadratic Casimir operators: We set the normalization of anti-hermitian generators T^a of the representation R as $\mathrm{tr}_R(T^a T^b) = -T(R)\delta^{ab}$ and $T^a T^a = -C_2(R)1$. We denote also $\mathrm{tr}_R(1) = \dim(R)$. From the structure constants in $[T^a, T^b] = f^{abc}T^c$, we define $f^{acd}f^{bcd} = C_2(G)\delta^{ab}$. For example, for the fundamental N representation of $SU(N)$ for which $\dim(N) = N$, the conventional normalization is

$$C_2(SU(N)) = N, \qquad T(N) = \frac{1}{2}, \qquad C_2(N) = \frac{N^2-1}{2N}. \tag{1.3}$$

2. Energy–momentum tensor with the dimensional regularization

The description of the energy–momentum tensor in gauge theory [3, 4] is particularly simple with the dimensional regularization.[5] This is because this regularization manifestly preserves the (vectorial) gauge symmetry and the translational invariance. Thus, in this section, we briefly recapitulate basic facts concerning the energy–momentum tensor on the basis of the dimensional regularization.

The action of the system under our consideration in a D dimensional euclidean space is given by

$$S = \frac{1}{4g_0^2}\int d^D x\, F^a_{\mu\nu}(x)F^a_{\mu\nu}(x) + \int d^D x\, \bar\psi(x)(\not{D} + m_0)\psi(x), \tag{2.1}$$

where g_0 and m_0 are bare gauge coupling and the mass parameter, respectively. The field strength is defined by

$$F_{\mu\nu}(x) = \partial_\mu A_\nu(x) - \partial_\nu A_\mu(x) + [A_\mu(x), A_\nu(x)], \tag{2.2}$$

for $A_\mu(x) = A^a_\mu(x)T^a$ and $F_{\mu\nu}(x) = F^a_{\mu\nu}(x)T^a$, and the covariant derivative on the fermion is

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu + A_\mu. \tag{2.3}$$

Here and in what follows, the summation over N_f fermion flavors is always suppressed. Our gamma matrices are hermitian and for the trace over the spinor index we set $\mathrm{tr}\,1 = 4$ for any D. We set also

$$D = 4 - 2\epsilon. \tag{2.4}$$

Assuming the dimensional regularization, one can derive a Ward–Takahashi relation associated with the translational invariance straightforwardly. We consider the following infinitesimal variation of integration variables in the functional integral:

$$\delta A_\mu(x) = \xi_\nu(x)F_{\nu\mu}(x), \qquad \delta\psi(x) = \xi_\mu(x)D_\mu\psi(x). \tag{2.5}$$

Then, since the action changes as[6]

$$\delta S = -\int d^D x\, \xi_\nu(x)\partial_\mu T_{\mu\nu}(x), \tag{2.6}$$

[5] Ref. [28] is a very nice exposition of the dimensional regularization.

[6] Here, to make the perturbation theory well-defined, we implicitly assume the existence of the gauge-fixing term and the Faddeev–Popov ghost fields. However, since they do not explicitly appear in correlation functions of gauge invariant operators, we neglect these elements.

where the energy–momentum tensor $T_{\mu\nu}(x)$ is defined by

$$T_{\mu\nu}(x) \equiv \frac{1}{g_0^2}\left[F^a_{\mu\rho}(x)F^a_{\nu\rho}(x) - \frac{1}{4}\delta_{\mu\nu}F^a_{\rho\sigma}(x)F^a_{\rho\sigma}(x)\right] + \frac{1}{4}\bar{\psi}(x)\left(\gamma_\mu \overleftrightarrow{D}_\nu + \gamma_\nu \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu\right)\psi(x) - \delta_{\mu\nu}\bar{\psi}(x)\left(\frac{1}{2}\overleftrightarrow{\not{D}} + m_0\right)\psi(x), \tag{2.7}$$

with

$$\overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu \equiv D_\mu - \overleftarrow{D}_\mu, \qquad \overleftarrow{D}_\mu \equiv \overleftarrow{\partial}_\mu - A_\mu, \tag{2.8}$$

we have

$$\int d^D x \, \langle \partial_\mu T_{\mu\nu}(x)\mathcal{O}\rangle = -\langle \partial_\nu \mathcal{O}\rangle \,, \tag{2.9}$$

for any gauge invariant operator $\mathcal{O}$. This relation shows that the energy–momentum tensor generates the infinitesimal translation and, at the same time, the bare quantity (2.7) does not receive any multiplicative renormalization. Thus, we define a renormalized finite energy–momentum tensor by subtracting its (possibly divergent) vacuum expectation value:

$$\{T_{\mu\nu}\}_R(x) \equiv T_{\mu\nu}(x) - \langle T_{\mu\nu}(x)\rangle \,. \tag{2.10}$$

A fundamental property of the energy–momentum tensor is the trace anomaly [29–33]. One simple way to derive this [34, 35] is to set $\xi_\mu(x) \propto x_\mu$ in Eq. (2.5) and compare the resulting relation with the renormalization group equation. After some consideration, this yields,

$$\delta_{\mu\nu}\{T_{\mu\nu}\}_R(x) = -\frac{\beta}{2g^3}\left\{F^a_{\rho\sigma}F^a_{\rho\sigma}\right\}_R(x) - (1+\gamma_m)m\left\{\bar{\psi}\psi\right\}_R(x), \tag{2.11}$$

where we assume that the renormalized operators in the right-hand side are defined in the MS scheme [28].[7] Throughout the present paper, we always assume that the vacuum expectation value is subtracted in renormalized operators. In Eq. (2.11), the renormalization group functions β and γ_m are defined by

$$\beta \equiv \left(\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial\mu}\right)_0 g = -\frac{1}{2}g\left(\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial\mu}\right)_0 \ln Z, \tag{2.12}$$

$$\gamma_m \equiv -\left(\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial\mu}\right)_0 \ln m = -\beta\frac{\partial}{\partial g}\ln Z_m, \tag{2.13}$$

where g and m are the renormalized gauge coupling and the renormalized mass, respectively, and the derivative with respect to the renormalization scale μ is taken with all bare quantities are kept fixed. The renormalization constants are defined by

$$g_0^2 = \mu^{2\epsilon}g^2 Z, \qquad m_0 = mZ_m^{-1}. \tag{2.14}$$

The first few terms of the perturbative expansion of those renormalization functions read

$$\beta = -b_0 g^3 - b_1 g^5 + O(g^7), \qquad \gamma_m = d_0 g^2 + d_1 g^4 + O(g^7), \tag{2.15}$$

where [36, 37]

$$b_0 = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}\left[\frac{11}{3}C_2(G) - \frac{4}{3}T(R)N_f\right], \tag{2.16}$$

$$b_1 = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^4}\left\{\frac{34}{3}C_2(G)^2 - \left[4C_2(R) + \frac{20}{3}C_2(G)\right]T(R)N_f\right\}, \tag{2.17}$$

[7] The renormalization in the MS scheme to the one-loop order is summarized in Appendix A.

and [38, 39]

$$d_0 = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} 6C_2(R), \tag{2.18}$$

$$d_1 = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^4} \left\{ 3C_2(R)^2 + \left[\frac{97}{3} C_2(G) - \frac{20}{3} T(R) N_f \right] C_2(R) \right\}. \tag{2.19}$$

3. Yang–Mills gradient flow

3.1. Flow equations and the perturbative expansion

The Yang–Mills gradient flow is a deformation of a gauge field configuration generated by a gradient flow in which the Yang–Mills action integral is regarded as a potential height. To be explicit, for the gauge potential $A_\mu(x)$, the flow is defined by [8, 9]

$$\partial_t B_\mu(t,x) = D_\nu G_{\nu\mu}(t,x) + \alpha_0 D_\mu \partial_\nu B_\nu(t,x), \qquad B_\mu(t=0,x) = A_\mu(x), \tag{3.1}$$

where t is the flow time and $G_{\mu\nu}(t,x)$ is the field strength of the flowed field,

$$G_{\mu\nu}(t,x) = \partial_\mu B_\nu(t,x) - \partial_\nu B_\mu(t,x) + [B_\mu(t,x), B_\nu(t,x)], \tag{3.2}$$

and the covariant derivative on the gauge field is

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu + [B_\mu, \cdot]. \tag{3.3}$$

The first term in the right-hand side of Eq. (3.1) is the "gradient" in the functional space, $-g_0^2 \delta S/\delta B_\mu(t,x)$, where S is the Yang–Mills action integral for the flowed field. Note that since $D_\nu G_{\nu\mu}(t,x) = \Delta B_\mu(t,x) + O(B^2)$, Eq. (3.1) is a sort of the diffusion equation and the flow for $t > 0$ effectively suppresses high frequency modes in the configuration. The second term in the right-hand side of Eq. (3.1) with the parameter α_0 is a "gauge fixing term" that makes the perturbative expansion well-defined. It can be shown, however, any gauge invariant quantities are independent of α_0. In actual perturbative calculation in the next section, we adopt the "Feynman gauge" $\alpha_0 = 1$ with which the expressions become simplest.

The formal solution of Eq. (3.1) is given by [8, 9]

$$B_\mu(t,x) = \int d^D y \left[K_t(x-y)_{\mu\nu} A_\nu(y) + \int_0^t ds\, K_{t-s}(x-y)_{\mu\nu} R_\nu(s,y) \right], \tag{3.4}$$

where[8]

$$K_t(x)_{\mu\nu} = \int_p \frac{e^{ipx}}{p^2} \left[(\delta_{\mu\nu} p^2 - p_\mu p_\nu) e^{-tp^2} + p_\mu p_\nu e^{-\alpha_0 t p^2} \right], \tag{3.6}$$

is the heat kernel and

$$R_\mu = 2[B_\nu, \partial_\nu B_\mu] - [B_\nu, \partial_\mu B_\nu] + (\alpha_0 - 1)[B_\mu, \partial_\nu B_\nu] + [B_\nu, [B_\nu, B_\mu]], \tag{3.7}$$

denotes non-linear interaction terms. By iteratively solving Eq. (3.4), we have a perturbative expansion for the flowed field $B_\mu(t,x)$ in terms of the initial value $A_\nu(y)$.

[8] Throughout the present paper, we use the abbreviation,

$$\int_p \equiv \int \frac{d^D p}{(2\pi)^D}. \tag{3.5}$$

A similar flow may be considered also for fermion fields [10]. For our purpose, it is not necessarily needed that the flow of fermion fields is a gradient flow of the original fermion action. A possible choice introduced in Ref. [10] is

$$\partial_t \chi(t,x) = \left[\Delta - \alpha_0 \partial_\mu B_\mu(t,x)\right] \chi(t,x), \qquad \chi(t=0,x) = \psi(x), \tag{3.8}$$

$$\partial_t \bar{\chi}(t,x) = \bar{\chi}(t,x) \left[\overleftarrow{\Delta} + \alpha_0 \partial_\mu B_\mu(t,x)\right], \qquad \bar{\chi}(t=0,x) = \bar{\psi}(x), \tag{3.9}$$

where

$$\Delta = D_\mu D_\mu, \qquad D_\mu = \partial_\mu + B_\mu, \tag{3.10}$$

$$\overleftarrow{\Delta} = \overleftarrow{D}_\mu \overleftarrow{D}_\mu, \qquad \overleftarrow{D}_\mu \equiv \overleftarrow{\partial}_\mu - B_\mu. \tag{3.11}$$

The formal solutions of the above flow equations are

$$\chi(t,x) = \int d^D y \left[K_t(x-y)\psi(y) + \int_0^t ds\, K_{t-s}(x-y)\Delta' \chi(s,y)\right], \tag{3.12}$$

$$\bar{\chi}(t,x) = \int d^D y \left[\bar{\psi}(y) K_t(x-y) + \int_0^t ds\, \bar{\chi}(s,y) \overleftarrow{\Delta}' K_{t-s}(x-y)\right], \tag{3.13}$$

where

$$K_t(x) \equiv \int_p e^{ipx} e^{-tp^2} = \frac{e^{-x^2/4t}}{(4\pi t)^{D/2}}, \tag{3.14}$$

and

$$\Delta' \equiv (1-\alpha_0)\partial_\mu B_\mu + 2B_\mu \partial_\mu + B_\mu B_\mu, \tag{3.15}$$

$$\overleftarrow{\Delta}' \equiv -(1-\alpha_0)\partial_\mu B_\mu - 2\overleftarrow{\partial}_\mu B_\mu + B_\mu B_\mu. \tag{3.16}$$

The initial values for the above flow, $A_\mu(x)$, $\psi(x)$, and $\bar{\psi}(x)$, are quantum fields being subject of the functional integral. The quantum correlation functions of the flowed fields are thus obtained by expressing the flowed fields in terms of original un-flowed fields (the initial values) and taking the functional average of the latter. Eqs. (3.4), (3.12), and (3.13), provide an explicit method to carry out this. For example, in the lowest (tree-level) approximation, we have

$$\left\langle B^a_\mu(t,x) B^b_\nu(s,y) \right\rangle = g_0^2 \delta^{ab} \delta_{\mu\nu} \int_p e^{ip(x-y)} \frac{e^{-(t+s)p^2}}{p^2}, \tag{3.17}$$

in the "Feynman gauge" in which $\lambda_0 = \alpha_0 = 1$, where λ_0 is the conventional gauge-fixing parameter. Similarly, for the fermion field, in the tree-level approximation,

$$\langle \chi(t,x) \bar{\chi}(s,y) \rangle = \int_p e^{ip(x-y)} \frac{e^{-(t+s)p^2}}{i\not{p} + m_0}. \tag{3.18}$$

Besides these "quantum propagators", we have also heat kernels, Eqs. (3.6) and (3.14), in the perturbative expansion of Eqs. (3.4), (3.12), and (3.13).

We now explain a diagrammatic representation of the perturbative expansion of flowed fields (the flow Feynman diagram). For quantum propagators (3.17) and (3.18), we use the standard convention such that the free propagator of the gauge boson is denoted by a wavy line and the free propagator of the fermion is denoted by an arrowed straight line. We stick to these conventions because these are quite natural in a system containing fermions. In Refs. [9] and [7], on the other hand, the arrowed straight line was adopted to represent



Fig. 1 C1



Fig. 2 C2



Fig. 3 C3

the gauge boson heat kernel (3.6). Since we already used this for the fermion propagator, in this paper, we instead use "doubled lines" to represent heat kernels (3.6) and (3.14). For instance, Figs. 1–5 are one-loop flow Feynman diagrams which contribute to the two-point function of the flowed fermion field. In these figures, the doubled straight line represents the fermion heat kernel (3.14); the arrow denotes the flow of the fermion number, not the direction of the flow time. Similarly, in Fig. 7, the doubled wavy line is the gauge boson heat kernel (3.6). In the present representation, we thus lose the information of the direction of the flow time, which is represented by an arrow in Refs. [9] and [7]. This information, however, can readily be traced back.

Another element of the flow Feynman diagram is the vertex. The vertices come from the original action (2.1) is denoted by a filled circle, while vertices come through the flow equations, Eqs. (3.7), (3.15), and (3.16), are denoted by an open circle as in Figs. 1–5; these conventions for the vertex are identical to those of Refs. [9] and [7].

3.2. Hatted fermion fields

A salient feature of the flowed fields is the UV finiteness: Any correlation functions of the flowed gauge field $B(t,x)$ with strictly positive t are, when expressed in terms of renormalized parameters, UV finite *without* the multiplicative (wave function) renormalization [9]. Moreover, this finiteness persists even for the equal-point limit. Thus, any correlation functions of any local products of $B(t,x)$ (with $t>0$) are UV finite without further renormalization other than the parameter renormalization. In other words, although those local products are given by a certain combination of the bare gauge field $A_\mu(x)$ through the flow equation, they are renormalized finite quantities. A basic reason for the above UV finiteness is that the propagator of the flowed gauge field (3.17) contains the gaussian dumping factor $\sim e^{-tp^2}$ which effectively provides a UV cutoff for $t>0$. To prove the above finiteness, however, one has to utilize also a BRS symmetry underlying the present system that is *inhomogeneous* with respect to the gauge potential [9].

Regrettably, the above finiteness in the first sense does not hold for the flowed fermion field. It *requires* the wave function renormalization. Although its propagator (3.18) also possesses the dumping factor $\sim e^{-tp^2}$, the BRS transformation is *homogeneous* on the fermion (and on general matter) field and the finiteness proof in Ref. [9] does not apply. In fact, computation of the one-loop diagrams in Figs. 1–5 shows that the wave function renormalization

$$\chi_R(t,x)=Z_\chi^{1/2}\chi(t,x),\qquad \bar\chi_R(t,x)=Z_\chi^{1/2}\bar\chi(t,x),\qquad Z_\chi=1+\frac{g^2}{(4\pi)^2}C_2(R)3\frac{1}{\epsilon}+O(g^4), \tag{3.19}$$

makes correlation functions UV finite [10]. Still the UV finiteness in the second sense above holds: Any correlation functions of any local products of $\chi_R(t,x)$ and $\bar\chi_R(t,x)$ remain UV finite [10].



Fig. 4 C4



Fig. 5 C5

Although the finiteness in the second sense is quite useful for our purpose, we still need to incorporate the renormalization factor Z_χ in Eq. (3.19). This introduces a complication to our problem, because we have to find somehow a relation between Z_χ in the dimensional regularization and that in the lattice regularization.

One possible way to avoid this complication is to normalize the fermion fields by their vacuum scalar condensation:[9]

$$\hat{\chi}(t,x) = \sqrt{\frac{-2\dim(R)N_f m}{(4\pi)^2 t\,\langle\bar{\chi}(t,x)\chi(t,x)\rangle}}\,\chi(t,x), \qquad \hat{\bar{\chi}}(t,x) = \sqrt{\frac{-2\dim(R)N_f m}{(4\pi)^2 t\,\langle\bar{\chi}(t,x)\chi(t,x)\rangle}}\,\bar{\chi}(t,x), \tag{3.20}$$

so that the multiplicative renormalization factor Z_χ is cancelled out in the new hatted variables. Note that the mass dimension of $\hat{\chi}(t,x)$ and $\hat{\bar{\chi}}(t,x)$ is 3/2 for any D, while that of $\chi(t,x)$ and $\bar{\chi}(t,x)$ is $(D-1)/2$.

The scalar condensation in the lowest (one-loop) order approximation is given by making a loop from the free propagator (3.18). For D-dimensions, we have

$$\langle\bar{\chi}(t,x)\chi(t,x)\rangle = \frac{-2\dim(R)N_f m_0}{(4\pi)^2 t}\frac{(8\pi t)^\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}[1+O(m_0^2 t)]. \tag{3.21}$$

Having obtained this expression, the constant factors in Eq. (3.20) have been chosen so that the difference between the hatted and the original variables becomes $O(g_0^2)$ for sufficiently small flow time ($m_0^2 t \ll 1$) for $D = 4$.

The next to leading order (i.e., two-loop) expression for the scalar condensation is given by making a loop by connecting both end points of the one-loop two-point functions in Figs. 1–5. The computation of these diagrams is somewhat complicated but can be completed in a similar manner as the calculation in Appendix B of Ref. [8] (with the integration formulas in our Appendix B, Eqs. (B1) and (B2)). The contribution of each diagram is tabulated in Table 1.[10] The scalar condensation to the two-loop approximation is thus given by

$$\langle\bar{\chi}(t,x)\chi(t,x)\rangle = \frac{-2\dim(R)N_f m_0}{(4\pi)^2 t}\left[\frac{(8\pi t)^\epsilon}{1-\epsilon} + \frac{g_0^2}{(4\pi)^2}C_2(R)\phi + O(m_0^2 t) + O(g_0^4)\right], \tag{3.22}$$

where

$$\phi \equiv 4 + 8\ln 2. \tag{3.23}$$

[9] In the scalar density in the condensation, the summation over N_f fermion flavor is understood.

[10] It turns out that for an analytic calculation it is convenient to treat the diagram C2 and C3 as a pair.

Table 1 Two-loop contributions to the scalar condensation in the unit of $\frac{-2\dim(R)N_f m_0}{(4\pi)^2 t}\frac{g_0^2}{(4\pi)^2}C_2(R)$.

diagram	
C1	$2\frac{1}{\epsilon} + 4\ln(8\pi t) + 6 + O(m_0^2 t)$
C2 and C3	$2\frac{1}{\epsilon} + 4\ln(8\pi t) + 4 + 2\ln\left(\frac{27}{4}\right) + O(m_0^2 t)$
C4	$6\ln\left(\frac{4}{3}\right) + O(m_0^2 t)$
C5	$-4\frac{1}{\epsilon} - 8\ln(8\pi t) - 6 + O(m_0^2 t)$

Finally, using Eq. (A2), for the factor in Eq. (3.20), we have

$$\frac{-2\dim(R)N_f m}{(4\pi)^2 t\,\langle\bar{\chi}(t,x)\chi(t,x)\rangle} = z(\epsilon)\left[1 + \frac{g^2}{(4\pi)^2}C_2(R)\left(3\frac{1}{\epsilon} - \phi\right) + O(m^2 t) + O(g^4)\right], \tag{3.24}$$

where

$$z(\epsilon) \equiv \frac{1-\epsilon}{(8\pi t)^\epsilon}. \tag{3.25}$$

4. Energy–momentum tensor constructed from the flowed fields

4.1. Small flow-time expansion and the renormalization group argument

To express the energy–momentum tensor in Eqs. (2.7) and (2.10) in terms of the flowed fields, we consider following second-rank symmetric tensors (which are even under the CP transformation) constructed from the flowed fields:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{1\mu\nu}(t,x) \equiv G^a_{\mu\rho}(t,x)G^a_{\nu\rho}(t,x), \tag{4.1}$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{2\mu\nu}(t,x) \equiv \delta_{\mu\nu}G^a_{\rho\sigma}(t,x)G^a_{\rho\sigma}(t,x), \tag{4.2}$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{3\mu\nu}(t,x) \equiv \hat{\bar{\chi}}(t,x)\left(\gamma_\mu \overleftrightarrow{D}_\nu + \gamma_\nu \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu\right)\hat{\chi}(t,x), \tag{4.3}$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{4\mu\nu}(t,x) \equiv \delta_{\mu\nu}\hat{\bar{\chi}}(t,x)\overleftrightarrow{\not{D}}\hat{\chi}(t,x), \tag{4.4}$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{5\mu\nu}(t,x) \equiv \delta_{\mu\nu}m\hat{\bar{\chi}}(t,x)\hat{\chi}(t,x), \tag{4.5}$$

where

$$\overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu \equiv D_\mu - \overleftarrow{D}_\mu. \tag{4.6}$$

Note that all the above operators $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i\mu\nu}(t,x)$ are of dimension 4 for any D.

We introduce also corresponding bare operators in the D-dimensional x-space:

$$\mathcal{O}_{1\mu\nu}(x) \equiv F^a_{\mu\rho}(x)F^a_{\nu\rho}(x), \tag{4.7}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{2\mu\nu}(x) \equiv \delta_{\mu\nu}F^a_{\rho\sigma}(x)F^a_{\rho\sigma}(x), \tag{4.8}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{3\mu\nu}(x) \equiv \bar{\psi}(x)\left(\gamma_\mu \overleftrightarrow{D}_\nu + \gamma_\nu \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu\right)\psi(x), \tag{4.9}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{4\mu\nu}(x) \equiv \delta_{\mu\nu}\bar{\psi}(x)\overleftrightarrow{\not{D}}\psi(x), \tag{4.10}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{5\mu\nu}(x) \equiv \delta_{\mu\nu}m_0\bar{\psi}(x)\psi(x). \tag{4.11}$$

The mass dimension of $\mathcal{O}_{1\mu\nu}(x)$ and $\mathcal{O}_{2\mu\nu}(x)$ is 4, while that of $\mathcal{O}_{3\mu\nu}(x)$, $\mathcal{O}_{4\mu\nu}(x)$, and $\mathcal{O}_{5\mu\nu}(x)$ is D.

We now consider the situation in which the flow time t in Eqs. (4.1)–(4.5) is very small. Since a flowed field at position x with a flow time t is a combination of un-flowed fields in the vicinity of x of the radius $\sim\sqrt{8t}$,[11] the operators (4.1)–(4.5) can be regarded as local operators in the x-space in the $t \to 0$ limit. Since the bare operators in Eqs. (4.7)–(4.11) span a complete set of symmetric second-rank gauge invariant local operators of dimension 4 (for $D \to 4$) which are even under CP, we have the following (asymptotic) expansion for a small t:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i\mu\nu}(t,x) = \left\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i\mu\nu}(t,x)\right\rangle + \zeta_{ij}(t)\left[\mathcal{O}_{j\mu\nu}(x) - \langle\mathcal{O}_{j\mu\nu}(x)\rangle\right] + O(t), \tag{4.12}$$

where abbreviated terms are contribution of operators of the mass dimension is 6 (for $D \to 4$) or higher.

In writing down the expansion (4.12), we have assumed that the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i\mu\nu}(t,x)$ is in isolation in the x-space, i.e., there is no other operator at the point x. If $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i\mu\nu}(t,x)$ and other operator merge at the point x, we would need further set of operators in the right-hand side of Eq. (4.12) other than those in Eqs. (4.7)–(4.11). This implies that the formula we will derive for the energy–momentum tensor below holds *only when the energy–momentum tensor has no overlap with other operators*.[12] In particular, we cannot say anything about whether the Ward–Takahashi relation (2.9) is reproduced with our construction. Still, our construction is expected to have a correct normalization because it is determined from a matching with the energy–momentum tensor in the dimensional regularization which fulfills Eq. (2.9). Our lattice energy–momentum tensor is thus useful to compute correlation functions in which the energy–momentum tensor is separated from other operators. This is the case for correlation functions relevant for the viscosities [40–42], for example.

The expansion (4.12) may be inverted as

$$\mathcal{O}_{i\mu\nu}(x) - \langle\mathcal{O}_{i\mu\nu}(x)\rangle = \left(\zeta^{-1}\right)_{ij}(t)\left[\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{j\mu\nu}(t,x) - \left\langle\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{j\mu\nu}(t,x)\right\rangle\right] + O(t), \tag{4.13}$$

[11] This follows from the fact that the flow equations are basically the diffusion equation.
[12] This important point was not fully recognized in Ref. [7].

where ζ^{-1} denotes the inverse matrix of ζ. Then by substituting this relation into the energy–momentum tensor (2.7) and (2.10) in terms of the bare operators,

$$\begin{aligned}\{T_{\mu\nu}\}_R(x) = \frac{1}{g_0^2}\Big\{ & \mathcal{O}_{1\mu\nu}(x) - \langle \mathcal{O}_{1\mu\nu}(x)\rangle - \frac{1}{4}\left[\mathcal{O}_{2\mu\nu}(x) - \langle \mathcal{O}_{2\mu\nu}(x)\rangle\right]\Big\} \\ & + \frac{1}{4}\left[\mathcal{O}_{3\mu\nu}(x) - \langle \mathcal{O}_{3\mu\nu}(x)\rangle\right] - \frac{1}{2}\left[\mathcal{O}_{4\mu\nu}(x) - \langle \mathcal{O}_{4\mu\nu}(x)\rangle\right] \\ & - \left[\mathcal{O}_{5\mu\nu}(x) - \langle \mathcal{O}_{5\mu\nu}(x)\rangle\right], \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

we have the expression (for $D = 4$)

$$\begin{aligned}\{T_{\mu\nu}\}_R(x) = {} & c_1(t)\left[\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{1\mu\nu}(t,x) - \frac{1}{4}\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{2\mu\nu}(t,x)\right] \\ & + c_2(t)\left[\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{2\mu\nu}(t,x) - \left\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{2\mu\nu}(t,x)\right\rangle\right] \\ & + c_3(t)\left[\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{3\mu\nu}(t,x) - 2\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{4\mu\nu}(t,x) - \left\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{3\mu\nu}(t,x) - 2\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{4\mu\nu}(t,x)\right\rangle\right] \\ & + c_4(t)\left[\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{4\mu\nu}(t,x) - \left\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{4\mu\nu}(t,x)\right\rangle\right] \\ & + c_5(t)\left[\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{5\mu\nu}(t,x) - \left\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{5\mu\nu}(t,x)\right\rangle\right] + O(t), \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & c_1(t) = \tilde{c}_1(t), \qquad c_2(t) = \tilde{c}_2(t) + \frac{1}{4}c_1(t), \\ & c_3(t) = \tilde{c}_3(t), \qquad c_4(t) = \tilde{c}_4(t) + 2c_3(t), \qquad c_5(t) = \tilde{c}_5(t), \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

and

$$\tilde{c}_i(t) \equiv \frac{1}{g_0^2}\left\{\left(\zeta^{-1}\right)_{1i}(t) - \frac{1}{4}\left(\zeta^{-1}\right)_{2i}(t)\right\} + \frac{1}{4}\left(\zeta^{-1}\right)_{3i}(t) - \frac{1}{2}\left(\zeta^{-1}\right)_{4i}(t) - \left(\zeta^{-1}\right)_{5i}(t). \tag{4.17}$$

In Eq. (4.15), we have used the fact that the finite operator $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{1\mu\nu}(t,x) - \frac{1}{4}\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{2\mu\nu}(t,x)$ is traceless in $D = 4$ and thus has no vacuum expectation value. Eq. (4.15) shows that if one knows the $t \to 0$ behavior of the coefficients $c_i(t)$, the energy–momentum tensor can be obtained as the $t \to 0$ limit of the combination in the right-hand side. As already noted, since the composite operators (4.1)–(4.5) constructed from (hatted) flowed fields should be independent of the regularization adopted, one may use the lattice regularization to compute correlation functions of the quantity in the right-hand side of Eq. (4.15). Thus this provides a possible method to compute correlation functions of the correctly-normalized conserved energy–momentum tensor with the lattice regularization.

Thus, we are interested in the $t \to 0$ behavior of the coefficients $c_i(t)$ in Eq. (4.15). Quite interestingly, one can argue that the coefficients $c_i(t)$ can be evaluated by the perturbation theory for $t \to 0$ thanks to the asymptotic freedom. To see this, we apply the operator

$$\left(\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial\mu}\right)_0, \tag{4.18}$$

to the both sides of Eq. (4.15), where μ is the renormalization scale and the subscript 0 implies that the derivative is taken while all bare quantities are kept fixed. Since the energy–momentum tensor is not multiplicatively renormalized, $(\mu\partial/\partial\mu)_0$(left-hand side of Eq. (4.15)) $= 0$. On the right-hand side, since $\tilde{O}_{1,2\mu\nu}(t,x)$,

$(1/m)\tilde{O}_{3,4\mu\nu}(t,x)$, and $(1/m^2)\tilde{O}_{5\mu\nu}(t,x)$ are entirely given by bare quantities through the flow equations (recall the definition of the hatted fields (3.20)), we have

$$\left(\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial\mu}\right)_0 \tilde{O}_{1,2\mu\nu}(t,x) = \left(\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial\mu}\right)_0 \frac{1}{m}\tilde{O}_{3,4\mu\nu}(t,x) = \left(\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial\mu}\right)_0 \frac{1}{m^2}\tilde{O}_{5\mu\nu}(t,x) = 0. \tag{4.19}$$

These facts imply,

$$\left(\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial\mu}\right)_0 c_{1,2}(t) = \left(\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial\mu}\right)_0 m c_{3,4}(t) = \left(\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial\mu}\right)_0 m^2 c_5(t) = 0. \tag{4.20}$$

Then the standard renormalization group argument tells that $c_{1,2}(t)$, $mc_{3,4}(t)$, and $m^2c_5(t)$ are independent of the renormalization scale, if the renormalized parameters in these quantities are replaced by running parameters defined by

$$q\frac{d\bar{g}(q)}{dq} = \beta(\bar{g}(q)), \qquad \bar{g}(q=\mu) = g, \tag{4.21}$$

$$q\frac{d\bar{m}(q)}{dq} = -\gamma_m(\bar{g}(q))\bar{m}(q), \qquad \bar{m}(q=\mu) = m, \tag{4.22}$$

where μ is the original renormalization scale. Thus since these quantities are independent of the renormalization scale, two possible choices, $q=\mu$ and $q=1/\sqrt{8t}$, should give an identical result. In this way, we infer that

$$c_{1,2}(t)(g,m;\mu) = c_{1,2}(t)(\bar{g}(1/\sqrt{8t}),\bar{m}(1/\sqrt{8t});1/\sqrt{8t}), \tag{4.23}$$

$$c_{3,4}(t)(g,m;\mu) = \frac{\bar{m}(1/\sqrt{8t})}{m}c_{3,4}(t)(\bar{g}(1/\sqrt{8t}),\bar{m}(1/\sqrt{8t});1/\sqrt{8t}), \tag{4.24}$$

$$c_5(t)(g,m;\mu) = \frac{\bar{m}(1/\sqrt{8t})^2}{m^2}c_5(t)(\bar{g}(1/\sqrt{8t}),\bar{m}(1/\sqrt{8t});1/\sqrt{8t}), \tag{4.25}$$

where we have explicitly written dependence of $c_i(t)$ on renormalized parameters and on the renormalization scale. Finally, since the running gauge coupling $\bar{g}(1/\sqrt{8t}) \to 0$ for $t \to 0$ thanks to the asymptotic freedom, we expect that we can compute $c_i(t)$ for $t \to 0$ by using the perturbation theory. Although we are interested in low-energy physics for which the perturbation theory is ineffective, the coefficients $c_i(t)$ for $t \to 0$ can be evaluated by the perturbation theory; this might be regarded as a sort of factorization.

4.2. $c_i(t)$ to the one-loop order

We thus evaluate the above coefficients $c_i(t)$ in Eq. (4.15) to the one-loop order approximation. For this, we compute the mixing coefficients $\zeta_{ij}(t)$ in Eq. (4.12) to the one-loop order. Then $c_i(t)$ are obtained by Eqs. (4.16) and (4.17). The loop expansion of $\zeta_{ij}(t)$ would yield

$$\zeta_{ij}(t) = \delta_{ij} + \zeta_{ij}^{(1)}(t) + \zeta_{ij}^{(2)}(t) + \cdots, \tag{4.26}$$

for $i=1$ and $i=2$, where the superscript denotes the loop order, and for $i=3$, 4, and 5, by taking the factor in Eq. (3.25) into account, we set

$$\zeta_{ij}(t) = z(\epsilon)\left[\delta_{ij} + \zeta_{ij}^{(1)}(t) + \zeta_{ij}^{(2)}(t) + \cdots\right]. \tag{4.27}$$

As Ref. [7], it is straightforward to compute $\zeta_{ij}^{(1)}(t)$: For example, to obtain $\zeta_{ij}^{(1)}(t)$ with $j=1$ and 2, we consider the correlation function

$$\left\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i\mu\nu}(t,x)A^b_\beta(y)A^c_\gamma(z)\right\rangle. \tag{4.28}$$



Fig. 6 A03



Fig. 7 A04



Fig. 8 A05

In the Feynman gauge to which we stick throughout the present paper, this has the structure,

$$g_0^2 \int_k \frac{e^{ik(x-y)}}{k^2} g_0^2 \int_\ell \frac{e^{i\ell(x-z)}}{\ell^2} \delta^{bc} \mathcal{M}_{\mu\nu,\beta\gamma}(k,l). \tag{4.29}$$

After expanding $\mathcal{M}_{\mu\nu,\beta\gamma}(k,l)$ to $O(k,\ell)$, we can make use of the following correspondence to read off the operator mixing:

$$ik_\mu i\ell_\nu \delta_{\beta\gamma} \to F^a_{\mu\rho}(x) F^a_{\nu\rho}(x), \qquad ik\cdot i\ell \delta_{\mu\nu}\delta_{\beta\gamma} \to \frac{1}{4}\delta_{\mu\nu} F^a_{\rho\sigma}(x) F^a_{\rho\sigma}(x). \tag{4.30}$$

In this way, we obtain $\zeta^{(1)}_{ij}(t)$ with $j = 1$ and 2.[13]

Similarly, to obtain $\zeta^{(1)}_{ij}(t)$ with $j = 3$, 4, and 5, we consider

$$\left\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i\mu\nu}(t,x)\psi(y)\bar{\psi}(z)\right\rangle, \tag{4.31}$$

whose general structure reads

$$\int_k \frac{e^{ik(y-x)}}{i\not{k} + m_0} \mathcal{M}_{\mu\nu}(k,l) \int_\ell \frac{e^{i\ell(x-z)}}{i\not{\ell} + m_0}. \tag{4.32}$$

We then expand $\mathcal{M}_{\mu\nu}(k,l)$ to $O(k)$ and $O(\ell)$ and use the correspondence,

$$\gamma_\mu i(k+\ell)_\nu + \gamma_\nu i(k+\ell)_\mu \to \bar{\psi}(x)\left[\gamma_\mu \overleftrightarrow{D}_\nu + \gamma_\nu \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu\right]\psi(x), \qquad \delta_{\mu\nu} \to \delta_{\mu\nu}\bar{\psi}(x)\psi(x), \tag{4.33}$$

to read off the operator mixing.

In the above calculation, we expand the integrand of the loop integration with respect to the bare mass m_0. Some diagrams then produce the $1/\epsilon$ pole as the result of the infrared divergence. We will find that, quite interestingly, these $1/\epsilon$ poles, in conjunction with the $1/\epsilon$ poles arising from the UV divergence of other diagrams, are cancelled out in $c_i(t)$; the $D \to 4$ limit of $c_i(t)$ is finite.

For $\zeta^{(1)}_{1j}(t)$, diagrams A3, A4, A5, A6, A7, A8, A9, A11, A13, A14, A15, A16, and A19 in Figs. 6–22 contribute.[14] In these and following diagrams, the cross generically represents one of composite operators in Eqs. (4.1)–(4.5) (in the present case, $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{1\mu\nu}(t,x)$). For

[13] For the momentum integration, we use the integration formulas in Appendix B.

[14] Diagrams A10, A12, A17 (where the dotted line represents the ghost propagator), A18 in these figures correspond to the conventional wave function renormalization and should be omitted in computing the operator mixing.



Fig. 9 A06



Fig. 10 A07



Fig. 11 A08



Fig. 12 A09



Fig. 13 A10



Fig. 14 A11



Fig. 15 A12



Fig. 16 A13



Fig. 17 A14



Fig. 18 A15



Fig. 19 A16



Fig. 20 A17

the diagrams except the last one A19, we can borrow the results from Ref. [7] (Table C1



Fig. 21 A18



Fig. 22 A19



Fig. 23 B03



Fig. 24 B04



Fig. 25 B05

of Appendix C). Combined with the contribution of diagram A19, we have

$$\zeta_{11}^{(1)}(t) = \frac{g_0^2}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(G) \left[\frac{11}{3} \epsilon(t)^{-1} + \frac{77}{24} \right], \tag{4.34}$$

$$\zeta_{12}^{(1)}(t) = \frac{g_0^2}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(G) \left[-\frac{11}{12} \epsilon(t)^{-1} - \frac{1}{8} \right], \tag{4.35}$$

$$\zeta_{13}^{(1)}(t) = \frac{g_0^4}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(R) \left[-\frac{2}{3} \epsilon(t)^{-1} - \frac{7}{18} \right], \tag{4.36}$$

$$\zeta_{14}^{(1)}(t) = \frac{g_0^4}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(R) \left[\frac{1}{3} \epsilon(t)^{-1} - \frac{7}{18} \right], \tag{4.37}$$

$$\zeta_{15}^{(1)}(t) = \frac{g_0^4}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(R) \left[3\epsilon(t)^{-1} + \frac{5}{2} \right], \tag{4.38}$$

where

$$\epsilon(t)^{-1} \equiv \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \ln(8\pi t). \tag{4.39}$$

From these, by considering the trace, we further have

$$\zeta_{21}^{(1)}(t) = 0, \tag{4.40}$$

$$\zeta_{22}^{(1)}(t) = \zeta_{11}^{(1)}(t) + \zeta_{12}^{(1)}(t)(4-2\epsilon) = \frac{g_0^2}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(G) \frac{109}{24}, \tag{4.41}$$

$$\zeta_{23}^{(1)}(t) = 0, \tag{4.42}$$

$$\zeta_{24}^{(1)}(t) = 2\zeta_{13}^{(1)}(t) + \zeta_{14}^{(1)}(t)(4-2\epsilon) = \frac{g_0^4}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(R)(-3), \tag{4.43}$$

$$\zeta_{25}^{(1)}(t) = \zeta_{15}^{(1)}(t)(4-2\epsilon) = \frac{g_0^4}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(R) \left[12\epsilon(t)^{-1} + 4 \right]. \tag{4.44}$$

To $\zeta_{3j}^{(1)}(t)$ with $j = 1$ and 2, diagrams B03, B04, B08, B09, B10, B11, and B12 contribute. The contribution of each diagram is tabulated in Table 2. To $\zeta_{3j}^{(1)}(t)$ with $j = 3$, 4, and 5,



Fig. 26 B06



Fig. 27 B07



Fig. 28 B08



Fig. 29 B09



Fig. 30 B10



Fig. 31 B11



Fig. 32 B12



Fig. 33 B13



Fig. 34 B14



Fig. 35 B15



Fig. 36 B16



Fig. 37 B17



Fig. 38 B18

diagrams B06, B07, B13, B14, B15, B16, B17, and B18 contribute and their contributions are tabulated in Table 3. As the sum of these contributions, we have

Table 2 $\zeta_{3j}^{(1)}$ in the unit of $\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}T(R)N_f$

diagram	$\zeta_{31}^{(1)}(t)$	$\zeta_{32}^{(1)}(t)$
B03	$-\frac{16}{3}\epsilon(t)^{-1}-\frac{64}{9}$	$\frac{4}{3}\epsilon(t)^{-1}+\frac{25}{9}$
B04	0	0
B08	0	$-\frac{1}{3}$
B09	$-\frac{5}{12}$	$-\frac{23}{144}$
B10	$\frac{5}{12}$	$-\frac{1}{16}$
B11	$\frac{10}{9}$	$\frac{7}{9}$
B12	0	0

$$\zeta_{31}^{(1)}(t)=\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}T(R)N_f\left[-\frac{16}{3}\epsilon(t)^{-1}-6\right], \tag{4.45}$$

$$\zeta_{32}^{(1)}(t)=\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}T(R)N_f\left[\frac{4}{3}\epsilon(t)^{-1}+3\right], \tag{4.46}$$

$$\zeta_{33}^{(1)}(t)=\frac{g^2}{(4\pi)^2}C_2(R)\left(3\frac{1}{\epsilon}-\phi\right)+\frac{g_0^2}{(4\pi)^2}C_2(R)\left[-\frac{1}{3}\epsilon(t)^{-1}+\frac{1}{18}\right], \tag{4.47}$$

$$\zeta_{34}^{(1)}(t)=\frac{g_0^2}{(4\pi)^2}C_2(R)\left[-\frac{4}{3}\epsilon(t)^{-1}-\frac{4}{9}\right], \tag{4.48}$$

$$\zeta_{35}^{(1)}(t)=0, \tag{4.49}$$

where in $\zeta_{33}^{(1)}(t)$ (4.47) the first term in the right-hand side comes from the conversion from the un-hatted fields to the hatted fields in Eq. (3.20) (see Eq. (3.24)); the constant ϕ is given

Table 3 $\zeta_{3j}^{(1)}$ in the unit of $\frac{g_0^2}{(4\pi)^2}C_2(R)$

diagram	$\zeta_{33}^{(1)}(t)$	$\zeta_{34}^{(1)}(t)$	$\zeta_{35}^{(1)}(t)$
B06	$-\frac{1}{3}\epsilon(t)^{-1}+\frac{1}{18}$	$\frac{2}{3}\epsilon(t)^{-1}+\frac{5}{9}$	$8\epsilon(t)^{-1}+8$
B07	$2\epsilon(t)^{-1}+2$	$-2\epsilon(t)^{-1}-2$	$-8\epsilon(t)^{-1}-8$
B13	0	1	0
B14	0	0	0
B15	$2\epsilon(t)^{-1}+2$	0	0
B16	0	0	0
B17	-2	0	0
B18	$-4\epsilon(t)^{-1}-2$	0	0

by Eq. (3.23). From these, we further have

$$\zeta_{41}^{(1)}(t)=0, \tag{4.50}$$

$$\zeta_{42}^{(1)}(t)=\frac{1}{2}\zeta_{31}^{(1)}(t)+\frac{1}{2}\zeta_{32}^{(1)}(t)(4-2\epsilon)=\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}T(R)N_f\frac{5}{3}, \tag{4.51}$$

$$\zeta_{43}^{(1)}(t)=0, \tag{4.52}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_{44}^{(1)}(t)&=\zeta_{33}^{(1)}(t)+\frac{1}{2}\zeta_{34}^{(1)}(t)(4-2\epsilon)\\&=\frac{g^2}{(4\pi)^2}C_2(R)\left(3\frac{1}{\epsilon}-\phi\right)+\frac{g_0^2}{(4\pi)^2}C_2(R)\left[-3\epsilon(t)^{-1}+\frac{1}{2}\right],\end{aligned} \tag{4.53}$$

$$\zeta_{45}^{(1)}(t)=0. \tag{4.54}$$

Finally,

$$\zeta_{51}^{(1)}(t)=\zeta_{52}^{(1)}(t)=\zeta_{53}^{(1)}(t)=\zeta_{54}^{(1)}(t)=0, \tag{4.55}$$

and $\zeta_{55}^{(1)}(t)$ is given by the sum of the contributions of one-loop diagrams in Table 4 and the conversion factor to the hatted fields:

$$\zeta_{55}^{(1)}(t)=\frac{g^2}{(4\pi)^2}C_2(R)\left(6\frac{1}{\epsilon}-\phi\right)+\frac{g_0^2}{(4\pi)^2}C_2(R)\left[-6\epsilon(t)^{-1}-2\right]. \tag{4.56}$$

We have now obtained all $\zeta_{ij}^{(1)}(t)$ in Eqs. (4.26) and (4.27). Then since the matrix $\zeta_{ij}(t)$ in the tree level approximation is unit matrix, it is straightforward to invert the matrix $\zeta_{ij}(t)$

Table 4 $\zeta_{55}^{(1)}(t)$ in the unit of $\frac{g_0^2}{(4\pi)^2}C_2(R)$.

diagram	$\zeta_{55}^{(1)}(t)$
B06	$-4\epsilon(t)^{-1}-2$
B13	0
B14	0
B15	$2\epsilon(t)^{-1}+2$
B16	0
B18	$-4\epsilon(t)^{-1}-2$

in the one-loop approximation; Eqs. (4.16) and (4.17) then yield

$$c_1(t) = \frac{1}{g_0^2}\left[1-\zeta_{11}^{(1)}(t)\right] - \frac{1}{4}\zeta_{31}^{(1)}(t), \tag{4.57}$$

$$c_2(t) = \frac{1}{g_0^2}\left(-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon\right)\zeta_{12}^{(1)}(t) + \left(\frac{3}{4}-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon\right)\zeta_{32}^{(1)}(t) + \frac{3}{16}\zeta_{31}^{(1)}(t), \tag{4.58}$$

$$c_3(t) = \left\{\frac{1}{g_0^2}\left[-\zeta_{13}^{(1)}(t)\right] + \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{4}\zeta_{33}^{(1)}(t)\right\} z(\epsilon)^{-1}, \tag{4.59}$$

$$c_4(t) = \left\{\frac{1}{g_0^2}\left[-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon\zeta_{14}^{(1)}(t) - \frac{3}{2}\zeta_{13}^{(1)}(t)\right] + \left(\frac{3}{4}-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon\right)\zeta_{34}^{(1)}(t)\right\} z(\epsilon)^{-1}, \tag{4.60}$$

$$c_5(t) = \left\{\frac{1}{g_0^2}\left[-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon\zeta_{15}^{(1)}(t)\right] - 1 + \zeta_{55}^{(1)}(t)\right\} z(\epsilon)^{-1}. \tag{4.61}$$

Then, by using the renormalized gauge coupling in the MS scheme (A1), to the one-loop order, we have (for $\epsilon \to 0$)

$$c_1(t) = \frac{1}{g^2} - b_0\ln(8\pi\mu^2 t) - \frac{7}{8}\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}\left[\frac{11}{3}C_2(G) - \frac{12}{7}T(R)N_f\right], \tag{4.62}$$

$$c_2(t) = \frac{1}{8}\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}\left[\frac{11}{3}C_2(G) + \frac{11}{3}T(R)N_f\right], \tag{4.63}$$

$$c_3(t) = \frac{1}{4}\left\{1 + \frac{g^2}{(4\pi)^2}C_2(R)\left[3\ln(8\pi\mu^2 t) + \frac{3}{2} + \phi\right]\right\}, \tag{4.64}$$

$$c_4(t) = \frac{1}{8}d_0 g^2, \tag{4.65}$$

$$c_5(t) = -\left\{1 + \frac{g^2}{(4\pi)^2}C_2(R)\left[6\ln(8\pi\mu^2 t) + \frac{7}{2} + \phi\right]\right\}. \tag{4.66}$$

Since $c_i(t)$ in Eq. (4.15) connect the finite energy–momentum tensor and UV finite local products $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i\mu\nu}(t,x)$ constructed from (hatted) flowed fields, they should be UV finite. That our explicit one-loop calculation of $c_i(t)$ confirms this finiteness is quite assuring.

If one prefers the $\overline{\rm MS}$ scheme instead of the MS scheme assumed in the above expressions, it suffices to make the replacement

$$\mu^2 \to \frac{e^{\gamma_E}}{4\pi}\mu^2, \tag{4.67}$$

where γ_E is the Euler's constant.

4.3. A consistency check: The trace anomaly

It is interesting to see that Eq. (4.15) with $c_i(t)$ in Eqs. (4.62)–(4.66) in fact reproduces the trace anomaly (2.11) in the one-loop approximation. At first brief glance, $c_2(t)$ in Eq. (4.63) is inconstant with the correct trace anomaly, because $\delta_{\mu\nu}[\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{1\mu\nu} - (1/4)\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{2\mu\nu}] = 0$ for $D = 4$ and $\delta_{\mu\nu}\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{2\mu\nu} = 4\left\{F^a_{\rho\sigma}F^a_{\rho\sigma}\right\}_R(x) + O(g^2)$ (the last equality follows from Eq. (A17)). On the other hand, $4c_2(t)$ from Eq. (4.63) is not identical to $b_0/2$, where b_0 is the first coefficient of the beta function (2.16), the correct one-loop coefficient in the trace anomaly.

This is a premature judgment, however. In fact, $\zeta^{(1)}_{42}(t)$ in Eq. (4.51) shows that there exists an operator mixing of the form

$$\hat{\bar{\chi}}(t,x)\overleftrightarrow{\not{D}}\hat{\chi}(t,x) = \left\{\bar{\psi}\overleftrightarrow{\not{D}}\psi\right\}_R(x) + \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}T(R)N_f\frac{5}{3}\left\{F^a_{\rho\sigma}F^a_{\rho\sigma}\right\}_R(x) + \cdots . \tag{4.68}$$

Then the last term precisely fills the difference between $4c_2(t)$ and $b_0/2$.

In this way, to the one-loop order, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{\mu\nu}\left\{T_{\mu\nu}\right\}_R(x) = {}& \frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}\left[\frac{11}{3}C_2(G) - \frac{4}{3}T(R)N_f\right]\left\{F^a_{\rho\sigma}F^a_{\rho\sigma}\right\}_R(x) \\ & - \frac{3}{2}\left\{\bar{\psi}\overleftrightarrow{\not{D}}\psi\right\}_R(x) - \left[4 + \frac{g^2}{(4\pi)^2}6C_2(R)\right]m\left\{\bar{\psi}\psi\right\}_R(x).\end{aligned} \tag{4.69}$$

This reproduces the trace anomaly (2.11) in the one-loop level if one uses the equation of motion of renormalized field,

$$\left\{\bar{\psi}\overleftrightarrow{\not{D}}\psi\right\}_R(x) = -2m\left\{\bar{\psi}\psi\right\}_R(x), \tag{4.70}$$

whose use is justified when there is no other operator in the point x as we are assuming. We observe that our one-loop result in Eqs. (4.62)–(4.66) is consistent with the trace anomaly.

In Ref. [7], for the pure Yang–Mills theory, the next to leading (two-loop order) term in $c_2(t)$ was determined as

$$c_2(t) = \frac{1}{8}b_0 - \frac{1}{8}b_0\left[\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}G_2(G)\frac{109}{24} - \frac{b_1}{b_0}\right]g^2, \tag{4.71}$$

where $b_0 = [1/(4\pi)^2](11/3)C_2(G)$ and $b_1 = [1/(4\pi)^4](34/3)C_2(G)^2$, by imposing that the expression (4.15) reproduces the trace anomaly (2.11) to the two-loop order. For the present system with fermions, however, it seems that this requirement alone cannot fix the next to leading terms in $c_2(t)$ and in $c_4(t)$; so we are contented with the one-loop formulas, Eqs. (4.62)–(4.66), in the present paper treating a system containing fermions.

4.4. Master formula

From Eq. (4.15), the energy–momentum tensor is given by the $t \to 0$ limit,

$$\begin{aligned}\{T_{\mu\nu}\}_R(x) = \lim_{t\to 0}\Big\{ & c_1(t)\left[\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{1\mu\nu}(t,x) - \frac{1}{4}\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{2\mu\nu}(t,x)\right] \\ & + c_2(t)\left[\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{2\mu\nu}(t,x) - \left\langle\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{2\mu\nu}(t,x)\right\rangle\right] \\ & + c_3(t)\left[\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{3\mu\nu}(t,x) - 2\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{4\mu\nu}(t,x) - \left\langle\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{3\mu\nu}(t,x) - 2\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{4\mu\nu}(t,x)\right\rangle\right] \\ & + c_4(t)\left[\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{4\mu\nu}(t,x) - \left\langle\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{4\mu\nu}(t,x)\right\rangle\right] \\ & + c_5(t)\left[\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{5\mu\nu}(t,x) - \left\langle\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{5\mu\nu}(t,x)\right\rangle\right]\Big\},\end{aligned} \tag{4.72}$$

where operators in the right-hand side are given by Eqs. (4.1)–(4.5). One may further use identities,

$$\left\langle\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{3\mu\nu}(t,x)\right\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\left\langle\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{4\mu\nu}(t,x)\right\rangle, \qquad \left\langle\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{5\mu\nu}(t,x)\right\rangle = \frac{-2\dim(R)N_f m^2}{(4\pi)^2 t}\delta_{\mu\nu}, \tag{4.73}$$

to make the expression a little bit simpler. Applying the consequence of the renormalization group argument, Eqs. (4.23)–(4.25), to Eqs. (4.62)–(4.66), we have

$$c_1(t) = \frac{1}{\bar{g}(1/\sqrt{8t})^2} - b_0\ln\pi - \frac{7}{8}\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}\left[\frac{11}{3}C_2(G) - \frac{12}{7}T(R)N_f\right], \tag{4.74}$$

$$c_2(t) = \frac{1}{8}\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}\left[\frac{11}{3}C_2(G) + \frac{11}{3}T(R)N_f\right], \tag{4.75}$$

$$c_3(t) = \frac{\bar{m}(1/\sqrt{8t})}{m}\frac{1}{4}\left[1 + \frac{\bar{g}(1/\sqrt{8t})^2}{(4\pi)^2}C_2(R)\left(3\ln\pi + \frac{3}{2} + \phi\right)\right], \tag{4.76}$$

$$c_4(t) = \frac{\bar{m}(1/\sqrt{8t})}{m}\frac{1}{8}d_0\bar{g}(1/\sqrt{8t})^2, \tag{4.77}$$

$$c_5(t) = -\frac{\bar{m}(1/\sqrt{8t})^2}{m^2}\left[1 + \frac{\bar{g}(1/\sqrt{8t})^2}{(4\pi)^2}C_2(R)\left(6\ln\pi + \frac{7}{2} + \phi\right)\right], \tag{4.78}$$

where $\bar{g}(q)$ is the running gauge coupling in the MS scheme and $\phi = 4 + 8\ln 2$. For going from the MS scheme to the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme, it suffice to make the following replacement corresponding to Eq. (4.67),

$$\ln\pi \to \gamma_E - 2\ln 2, \tag{4.79}$$

in the above expressions. Eq. (4.72) with Eqs. (4.74)–(4.78) is our main result.

One may wonder when the formulas (4.72)–(4.78) are used in actual lattice simulations, what value of the renormalized mass m should be used, because in the derivation above m was assumed to be renormalized in the MS or $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme that refers to the dimensional regularization. This question is, however, not relevant because the products appearing in the master formula,

$$\frac{1}{m}\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{3,4\mu\nu}(t,x), \qquad \frac{1}{m^2}\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{5\mu\nu}(t,x), \tag{4.80}$$

are independent of the mass parameter m when expressed in terms of the original flowed fermion fields $\chi(t,x)$ and $\bar{\chi}(t,x)$ (see the definition of the hatted variables (3.20)). For the

running mass parameter $\bar{m}(1/\sqrt{8t})$ for $t \to 0$, one may use the relation

$$\bar{m}(q) = [2b_0\bar{g}(q)^2]^{d_0/2b_0} \exp\left\{\int_0^{\bar{g}(q)} dg \left[-\frac{\gamma_m(g)}{\beta(g)} - \frac{d_0}{b_0 g}\right]\right\} m^\infty$$
$$= \left(\frac{2}{\ell}\right)^{d_0/2b_0} \left[1 - \frac{d_0 b_1}{2b_0^3 \ell}(1 + \ln \ell) + \frac{d_1}{2b_0^2 \ell} + O(\ell^{-2})\right] m^\infty, \qquad \ell \equiv \ln(q^2/\Lambda^2), \quad (4.81)$$

where m^∞ denotes the renormalization group invariant mass parameter. The renormalization group invariant mass parameter may be determined by using the method established in Ref. [43], for example.

5. Equation of motion in the small flow-time limit

Let us consider the following representations in the small flow-time:

$$\delta_{\mu\nu}\left[\bar{\psi}(x)\overleftrightarrow{\not{D}}\psi(x) + 2m_0\bar{\psi}(x)\psi(x)\right]$$
$$= d_2(t)\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{2\mu\nu}(t,x) + d_4(t)\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{4\mu\nu}(t,x) + d_5(t)\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{5\mu\nu} + O(t), \quad (5.1)$$

and

$$\delta_{\mu\nu} m_0\bar{\psi}(x)\psi(x) = e_5(t)\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{5\mu\nu}(t,x) + O(t), \quad (5.2)$$

where it is understood that the vacuum expectation values are subtracted in both sides of equations. By a renormalization group argument identical to that led to Eq. (4.23)–(4.25) and one-loop calculation in Sec. 4, for $t \to 0$ we have,

$$d_2(t) = -\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}T(R)N_f\frac{5}{3} + O(\bar{g}^2), \quad (5.3)$$

$$d_4(t) = \frac{\bar{m}(1/\sqrt{8t})}{m}\left[1 + \frac{\bar{g}(1/\sqrt{8t})^2}{(4\pi)^2}C_2(R)\left(3\ln\pi - \frac{1}{2} + \phi\right) + O(\bar{g}^4)\right], \quad (5.4)$$

$$d_5(t) = \frac{\bar{m}(1/\sqrt{8t})^2}{m^2}\left[1 + \frac{\bar{g}(1/\sqrt{8t})^2}{(4\pi)^2}C_2(R)\left(6\ln\pi + 2 + \phi\right) + O(\bar{g}^4)\right], \quad (5.5)$$

and $e_5(t) = (1/2)d_5(t)$ up to $O(\bar{g}^4)$. We note that since the combination in Eq. (5.1) is proportional to the equation of motion of the fermion field, when the position x does not coincide with positions of other operators in the correlation function, we may set the combination zero (the Schwinger–Dyson equation). This implies that we can make the replacement (the subtraction of the vacuum expectation value is understood)

$$\frac{\bar{m}(1/\sqrt{8t})}{m}\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{4\mu\nu}(t,x)$$
$$= \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}T(R)N_f\frac{5}{3}\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{2\mu\nu}(t,x)$$
$$- \frac{\bar{m}(1/\sqrt{8t})^2}{m^2}2\left[1 + \frac{\bar{g}(1/\sqrt{8t})^2}{(4\pi)^2}C_2(R)\left(3\ln\pi + \frac{5}{2}\right)\right]\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{5\mu\nu}(t,x), \quad (5.6)$$

in the master formula (4.72), because throughout this paper we are assuming that the energy–momentum tensor $\{T_{\mu\nu}\}_R(x)$ is separated from other operators in correlation functions. This makes the expression of the energy–momentum tensor somewhat simpler.

If one is interested in the trace part of the energy–momentum tensor, much simpler expression can be derived by this way. By taking the trace of Eq. (4.72), using Eq. (5.6), we have an expression quite analogous to the trace anomaly (2.11),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\delta_{\mu\nu}\left\{T_{\mu\nu}\right\}_R(x) \\
&= \lim_{t\to 0}\Bigg\{\frac{1}{2}b_0 G^a_{\rho\sigma}(t,x)G^a_{\rho\sigma}(t,x) \\
&\qquad - \frac{\bar{m}(1/\sqrt{8t})^2}{m^2}\left[1+\frac{\bar{g}(1/\sqrt{8t})^2}{(4\pi)^2}C_2(R)\left(6\ln\pi+8+\phi\right)\right] m\hat{\bar{\chi}}(t,x)\hat{\chi}(t,x)\Bigg\}, \qquad (5.7)
\end{aligned}$$

where the subtraction of the vacuum expectation value is understood.

6. Conclusion

In the present paper, on the basis of the Yang–Mills gradient flow, we constructed a formula (4.72) that provides a possible method to compute correlation functions containing the energy–momentum tensor in lattice gauge theory with (massive) fermions. This is a natural generalization of the construction in Ref. [7] for the pure Yang–Mills theory. Although the feasibility of the application in lattice Monte Carlo simulations remains to be carefully investigated, the experience for the thermodynamics of the quenched QCD [27] strongly indicates that there exists a window (1.2) with which one can reliably carry out the extrapolation for $t \to 0$ in Eq. (4.72), with presently-available lattice parameters.

An important question that we cannot answer at this moment is whether one can set the mass parameter zero from the onset in our formula (4.72). This question arises because we normalized the fermion fields by their scalar condensation as Eq. (3.20) to avoid the determination of the wave function renormalization factor Z_χ in Eq. (3.19). As shown in Eq. (3.21), the condensation in perturbation theory vanishes for the massless fermion and thus the normalization by the condensation would be a singular operation for the massless fermion. One might expect a non-zero scalar condensation in the non-perturbative level in theories like QCD and in such theories the formula might be meaningful even with a vanishing mass parameter. There exists, however, at least one class of interesting theories in which we do not expect the condensation for the massless fermion; theories which possess an infrared fixed point. Since it must be very interesting to consider the energy–momentum tensor in these infrared-conformal theories (which are subject of recent active investigations; see contributions in the last lattice conference [44, 45] and references cited therein), a better method to incorporate the wave function renormalization of the flowed fermion fields seems desirable.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank following people for valuable remarks: Sinya Aoki, Masayuki Asakawa, Michael G. Endres, Shoji Hashimoto, Tetsuo Hatsuda, Etsuko Itou, Yoshio Kikukawa, Masakiyo Kitazawa, Tetsuya Onogi, Giancarlo Rossi, Shoichi Sasaki, Yusuke Taniguchi, and especially Martin Lüscher also for making his private research notes available. The work of H. S. is supported in part by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research 23540330.

A. One-loop renormalization in the MS scheme

A.1. Parameters, elementary fields

The gauge coupling

$$g_0^2 = \mu^{2\epsilon} g^2 \left\{ 1 + \frac{g^2}{(4\pi)^2} \left[-\frac{11}{3} C_2(G) + \frac{4}{3} T(R) N_f \right] \frac{1}{\epsilon} + O(g^4) \right\}. \tag{A1}$$

The fermion mass

$$m_0 = m \left[1 + \frac{g^2}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(R)(-3) \frac{1}{\epsilon} + O(g^4) \right]. \tag{A2}$$

The gauge potential (in the Feynman gauge)

$$A_\mu^a(x) = \left[1 + \frac{g^2}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(G)(-1) \frac{1}{\epsilon} + O(g^4) \right] A_{\mu R}^a(x). \tag{A3}$$

The fermion field

$$\psi(x) = \left[1 + \frac{g^2}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(R) \left(-\frac{1}{2} \right) \frac{1}{\epsilon} + O(g^4) \right] \psi_R(x). \tag{A4}$$

A.2. Composite operators

The bare operators (4.7)–(4.11) and renormalized counterparts,

$$\{\mathcal{O}_{1\mu\nu}\}_R(x) \equiv \left\{ F_{\mu\rho}^a F_{\nu\rho}^a \right\}_R(x), \tag{A5}$$

$$\{\mathcal{O}_{2\mu\nu}\}_R(x) \equiv \delta_{\mu\nu} \left\{ F_{\rho\sigma}^a F_{\rho\sigma}^a \right\}_R(x), \tag{A6}$$

$$\{\mathcal{O}_{3\mu\nu}\}_R(x) \equiv \left\{ \bar{\psi} \left(\gamma_\mu \overleftrightarrow{D}_\nu + \gamma_\nu \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu \right) \psi \right\}_R(x), \tag{A7}$$

$$\{\mathcal{O}_{4\mu\nu}\}_R(x) \equiv \delta_{\mu\nu} \left\{ \bar{\psi} \overleftrightarrow{\not{D}} \psi \right\}_R(x), \tag{A8}$$

$$\{\mathcal{O}_{5\mu\nu}\}_R(x) \equiv \delta_{\mu\nu} m \left\{ \bar{\psi}\psi \right\}_R(x), \tag{A9}$$

are related as

$$\mathcal{O}_{i\mu\nu}(x) = Z_{ij} \{\mathcal{O}_{j\mu\nu}\}_R(x). \tag{A10}$$

The gluonic contribution to the operator renormalization of $\mathcal{O}_{1\mu\nu}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{2\mu\nu}$ was determined in Ref. [7]. By further computing fermionic contributions to the operator renormalization (corresponding to diagrams A18 and A19 in the main text) and taking the gauge coupling and wave function normalizations (Eqs. (A1) and (A3)) into account, we have

$$Z_{11} = 1 + \frac{g^2}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(G) \left(-\frac{11}{3} \right) \frac{1}{\epsilon} + O(g^4), \tag{A11}$$

$$Z_{12} = \frac{g^2}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(G) \frac{11}{12} \frac{1}{\epsilon} + O(g^4), \tag{A12}$$

$$Z_{13} = \frac{g^4}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(R) \frac{2}{3} \frac{1}{\epsilon} + O(g^6), \tag{A13}$$

$$Z_{14} = \frac{g^4}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(R) \left(-\frac{1}{3} \right) \frac{1}{\epsilon} + O(g^6), \tag{A14}$$

$$Z_{15} = \frac{g^4}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(R)(-3) \frac{1}{\epsilon} + O(g^6), \tag{A15}$$

and

$$Z_{21} = 0, \tag{A16}$$

$$Z_{22} = 1 + O(g^4), \tag{A17}$$

$$Z_{23} = 0, \tag{A18}$$

$$Z_{24} = O(g^6), \tag{A19}$$

$$Z_{25} = \frac{g^4}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(R)(-12)\frac{1}{\epsilon} + O(g^6). \tag{A20}$$

From these, to the one-loop order, we further have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\delta_{\mu\nu} \left\{ F^a_{\mu\rho} F^a_{\nu\rho} \right\}_R (x) \\
&= \left[1 + \frac{g^2}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(G) \left(\frac{11}{6} \right) \right] \left\{ F^a_{\rho\sigma} F^a_{\rho\sigma} \right\}_R (x) \\
&\quad + \frac{g^4}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(R) \left(-\frac{2}{3} \right) \left\{ \bar{\psi} \overleftrightarrow{\not{D}} \psi \right\}_R (x) + \frac{g^4}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(R)(-6) m \left\{ \bar{\psi}\psi \right\}_R (x).
\end{aligned} \tag{A21}$$

On the other hand, the computation of diagrams B03, B04, B05, B06, B07, combined with the wave function renormalization (A4), shows

$$Z_{31} = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} T(R) N_f \frac{16}{3} \frac{1}{\epsilon} + O(g^2), \tag{A22}$$

$$Z_{32} = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} T(R) N_f \left(-\frac{4}{3} \right) \frac{1}{\epsilon} + O(g^2), \tag{A23}$$

$$Z_{33} = 1 + \frac{g^2}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(R) \left(-\frac{8}{3} \right) \frac{1}{\epsilon} + O(g^4), \tag{A24}$$

$$Z_{34} = \frac{g^2}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(R) \frac{4}{3} \frac{1}{\epsilon} + O(g^4), \tag{A25}$$

$$Z_{35} = O(g^4), \tag{A26}$$

and

$$Z_{41} = Z_{43} = 0, \qquad Z_{42} = Z_{45} = O(g^4), \qquad Z_{44} = 1 + O(g^4). \tag{A27}$$

The consistency of these relations shows

$$\begin{aligned}
&\delta_{\mu\nu} \left\{ \bar{\psi} \gamma_\mu \overleftrightarrow{D}_\nu \psi \right\}_R (x) \\
&= \left[1 + \frac{g^2}{(4\pi)^2} C_2(R) \frac{4}{3} \right] \left\{ \bar{\psi} \overleftrightarrow{\not{D}} \psi \right\}_R (x) + \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} T(R) N_f \left(-\frac{4}{3} \right) \left\{ F^a_{\rho\sigma} F^a_{\rho\sigma} \right\}_R (x).
\end{aligned} \tag{A28}$$

Finally, a general theorem (see, for example, Ref. [28]) tells that

$$Z_{51} = Z_{52} = Z_{53} = Z_{54} = 0, \qquad Z_{55} = 1. \tag{A29}$$

B. Integration formulas

$$\int_\ell \frac{1}{(\ell^2)^\alpha} e^{-s\ell^2} = \frac{\Gamma(D/2-\alpha)}{(4\pi)^{D/2}\Gamma(D/2)} s^{\alpha-D/2}. \tag{B1}$$

$$\int_k \int_\ell \frac{e^{-sk^2-u\ell^2-v(k+\ell)^2}}{k^2} = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^D (D/2-1)(u+v)} (su+uv+vs)^{1-D/2}. \tag{B2}$$

$$\int_\ell e^{-s\ell^2} = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{D/2}} s^{-D/2}. \tag{B3}$$

$$\int_\ell e^{-s\ell^2} \ell_\mu \ell_\nu = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{D/2}} s^{-D/2-1} \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\mu\nu}. \tag{B4}$$

$$\int_\ell e^{-s\ell^2} \ell_\mu \ell_\nu \ell_\rho \ell_\sigma = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{D/2}} s^{-D/2-2} \frac{1}{4} \left(\delta_{\mu\nu}\delta_{\rho\sigma} + \delta_{\mu\rho}\delta_{\nu\sigma} + \delta_{\mu\sigma}\delta_{\nu\rho}\right). \tag{B5}$$

$$\int_\ell e^{-s\ell^2} \ell_\mu \ell_\nu \ell_\rho \ell_\sigma \ell_\alpha \ell_\beta = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{D/2}} s^{-D/2-3} \frac{1}{8} \left(\delta_{\mu\nu}\delta_{\rho\sigma}\delta_{\alpha\beta} + 14 \text{ permutations}\right). \tag{B6}$$

$$\int_\ell \frac{1}{\ell^2} e^{-s\ell^2} = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{D/2}} \frac{1}{D/2-1} s^{-D/2+1}. \tag{B7}$$

$$\int_\ell \frac{1}{\ell^2} e^{-s\ell^2} \ell_\mu \ell_\nu = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{D/2}} \frac{1}{D} s^{-D/2} \delta_{\mu\nu}. \tag{B8}$$

$$\int_\ell \frac{1}{\ell^2} e^{-s\ell^2} \ell_\mu \ell_\nu \ell_\rho \ell_\sigma = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{D/2}} \frac{1}{2(D+2)} s^{-D/2-1} \left(\delta_{\mu\nu}\delta_{\rho\sigma} + \delta_{\mu\rho}\delta_{\nu\sigma} + \delta_{\mu\sigma}\delta_{\nu\rho}\right). \tag{B9}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_\ell \frac{1}{\ell^2} e^{-s\ell^2} \ell_\mu \ell_\nu \ell_\rho \ell_\sigma \ell_\alpha \ell_\beta \\ &= \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{D/2}} \frac{1}{4(D+4)} s^{-D/2-2} \left(\delta_{\mu\nu}\delta_{\rho\sigma}\delta_{\alpha\beta} + 14 \text{ permutations}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{B10}$$

C. Gluonic contributions to $\zeta_{1j}^{(1)}(t)$

References

[1] C. G. Callan, Jr., S. R. Coleman and R. Jackiw, Annals Phys. **59**, 42 (1970).
[2] S. R. Coleman and R. Jackiw, Annals Phys. **67**, 552 (1971).
[3] D. Z. Freedman, I. J. Muzinich and E. J. Weinberg, Annals Phys. **87**, 95 (1974).
[4] S. D. Joglekar, Annals Phys. **100**, 395 (1976) [Erratum-ibid. **102**, 594 (1976)].
[5] S. Caracciolo, G. Curci, P. Menotti and A. Pelissetto, Nucl. Phys. B **309**, 612 (1988).
[6] S. Caracciolo, G. Curci, P. Menotti and A. Pelissetto, Annals Phys. **197**, 119 (1990).
[7] H. Suzuki, PTEP **2013**, no. 8, 083B03 (2013) [arXiv:1304.0533 [hep-lat]].
[8] M. Lüscher, JHEP **1008**, 071 (2010) [arXiv:1006.4518 [hep-lat]].
[9] M. Lüscher and P. Weisz, JHEP **1102**, 051 (2011) [arXiv:1101.0963 [hep-th]].
[10] M. Lüscher, JHEP **1304**, 123 (2013) [arXiv:1302.5246 [hep-lat]].
[11] L. Giusti and H. B. Meyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 131601 (2011) [arXiv:1011.2727 [hep-lat]].
[12] L. Giusti and H. B. Meyer, JHEP **1301**, 140 (2013) [arXiv:1211.6669 [hep-lat]].
[13] D. Robaina and H. B. Meyer, arXiv:1310.6075 [hep-lat].
[14] L. Giusti and H. B. Meyer, PoS LATTICE **2013**, 214 (2013) [arXiv:1310.7818 [hep-lat]].
[15] L. Giusti and M. Pepe, arXiv:1311.1012 [hep-lat].
[16] L. Giusti and M. Pepe, arXiv:1403.0360 [hep-lat].
[17] H. Suzuki, Phys. Lett. B **719**, 435 (2013) [arXiv:1209.5155 [hep-lat]].
[18] M. Lüscher, arXiv:1308.5598 [hep-lat].
[19] S. Borsanyi, S. Dürr, Z. Fodor, C. Hoelbling, S. D. Katz, S. Krieg, T. Kurth and L. Lellouch *et al.*, JHEP **1209**, 010 (2012) [arXiv:1203.4469 [hep-lat]].

Table C1 $\zeta_{1j}^{(1)}$ in the unit of $\frac{g_0^2}{(4\pi)^2}C_2(G)$

diagram	$\zeta_{11}^{(1)}(t)$	$\zeta_{12}^{(1)}(t)$
A03	0	0
A04	$-3\epsilon(t)^{-1}-1$	0
A05	$-\frac{7}{36}$	$-\frac{49}{144}$
A06	$2\epsilon(t)^{-1}-\frac{1}{2}$	0
A07	$\frac{19}{288}$	$\frac{121}{384}$
A08	$\frac{47}{96}$	$\frac{53}{128}$
A09	$-\frac{25}{8}$	0
A11	$\frac{1}{3}\epsilon(t)^{-1}-\frac{17}{36}$	$\frac{7}{12}\epsilon(t)^{-1}+\frac{1}{144}$
A13	$-\frac{5}{3}\epsilon(t)^{-1}+\frac{25}{36}$	$-\frac{3}{2}\epsilon(t)^{-1}-\frac{29}{16}$
A14	$3\epsilon(t)^{-1}+3$	0
A15	$3\epsilon(t)^{-1}+\frac{5}{2}$	0
A16	$\frac{7}{4}$	$\frac{31}{24}$

[20] S. Borsanyi, S. Dürr, Z. Fodor, S. D. Katz, S. Krieg, T. Kurth, S. Mages and A. Schafer *et al.*, arXiv:1205.0781 [hep-lat].
[21] Z. Fodor, K. Holland, J. Kuti, D. Nogradi and C. H. Wong, JHEP **1211**, 007 (2012) [arXiv:1208.1051 [hep-lat]].
[22] P. Fritzsch and A. Ramos, JHEP **1310**, 008 (2013) [arXiv:1301.4388 [hep-lat]].
[23] C. Monahan and K. Orginos, arXiv:1311.2310 [hep-lat].
[24] A. Shindler, arXiv:1312.4908 [hep-lat].
[25] C. Bonati and M. D'Elia, arXiv:1401.2441 [hep-lat].
[26] L. Del Debbio, A. Patella and A. Rago, JHEP **1311**, 212 (2013) [arXiv:1306.1173 [hep-th]].
[27] M. Asakawa *et al.* [FlowQCD Collaboration], arXiv:1312.7492 [hep-lat].
[28] J. C. Collins, "Renormalization. An Introduction To Renormalization, The Renormalization Group, And The Operator Product Expansion," Cambridge, Uk: Univ. Pr. (1984) 380p
[29] R. J. Crewther, Phys. Rev. Lett. **28**, 1421 (1972).
[30] M. S. Chanowitz and J. R. Ellis, Phys. Lett. B **40**, 397 (1972).
[31] S. L. Adler, J. C. Collins and A. Duncan, Phys. Rev. D **15**, 1712 (1977).

[32] N. K. Nielsen, Nucl. Phys. B **120**, 212 (1977).
[33] J. C. Collins, A. Duncan and S. D. Joglekar, Phys. Rev. D **16**, 438 (1977).
[34] K. Fujikawa, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 2262 (1981).
[35] K. Fujikawa and H. Suzuki, "Path integrals and quantum anomalies," Oxford, UK: Clarendon (2004) 284 p
[36] W. E. Caswell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **33**, 244 (1974).
[37] D. R. T. Jones, Nucl. Phys. B **75**, 531 (1974).
[38] R. Tarrach, Nucl. Phys. B **183**, 384 (1981).
[39] O. Nachtmann and W. Wetzel, Nucl. Phys. B **187**, 333 (1981).
[40] A. Nakamura and S. Sakai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 072305 (2005) [hep-lat/0406009].
[41] H. B. Meyer, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 101701 (2007) [arXiv:0704.1801 [hep-lat]].
[42] H. B. Meyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 162001 (2008) [arXiv:0710.3717 [hep-lat]].
[43] S. Capitani *et al.* [ALPHA Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. B **544**, 669 (1999) [hep-lat/9810063].
[44] E. Itou, arXiv:1311.2676 [hep-lat].
[45] Z. Fodor, K. Holland, J. Kuti, D. Nogradi and C. H. Wong, arXiv:1401.2176 [hep-lat].